THE HIGHER CRITICISM AND ITS CONCLUSIONS.

The Substance of Three Discourses
Preached in the

First Presbyterian Church,

NORFOLK, VA.,

By

Geo. D. Armstrong, D.D. Pastor.

NORFOLK, VA.
Published by the Congregation,
1884.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM AND ITS CONCLUSIONS.

The Substance of Three Discourses
Preached in the

First Presbyterian Church,

NORFOLK, VA.,

By

Geo. D. Armstrong, D.D. Pastor.

NORFOLK, VA.
Published by the Congregation,
1884.

The Higher Criticism.

"THE LAW WAS GIVEN BY MOSES."—JOHN I: 17.

Of late, we have heard much of what is popularly styled "the Higher Criticism," and of the results of the application of the principles of this "higher criticism" to the Scriptures.

What is this higher criticism? and what does it profess? What it is, is a question we will be better prepared to answer at a later stage of this discussion. What it professes is, to judge of and decide all questions respecting the interpretation, the authorship and the credibility of the Scriptures, just as we would similar questions respecting any other book. Rightly understood, no one can object to such a proceeding as this. How the higher critics understand it, we shall see in the course of our investigation.

What are the conclusions to which the higher critics have come, in applying their principles of criticism to the Scriptures? To this question it is impossible to give a definite answer, for no two of them agree. Confining our attention to the Pentateuch.

Professor Robertson Smith comes to the conclusion, that a small part of Exodus, viz: ch 21–23, and the first eleven chapters of Deuteronomy, were written by Moses; but by far the larger part was written in the days of Josiah; was in fact "the book of the Law" found in repairing the temple, (see II Kings ch. 22,) 800 years after Moses' day; and the remainder is made up of traditions, first reduced to writing, after the Jews return from captivity in Babylon, probably by Ezra, 200 years later still—these last-mentioned portions being ascribed to Moses, in order to give them greater authority among the Jews.

The conclusions to which Professor Crawford H. Toy, of Harvard, the latest American writer on the side of "the higher criticism" comes, I will state in his own words. In his "History of the Religion of Israel" he writes:—

"*Moses' work uncertain.* If we cannot suppose that the Pentateuch "(the "five books of Moses") is correct history, then we do not know "precisely what Moses did for his people. Did he try to make them "more humane, as well as more spiritual? It seems that in those

"days they were half barbarians; was Moses a reformer like the "Athenian Solon? It is hard to say * * From all that we do "know, we are led to belive that what Moses did, was rather to or- "ganize the people, and give them an impulse in religion, than to "frame any code of laws, or make any great change in their institu- "tions. In after years it became the fashion, to think of him as the "author of almost all the religious customs of the land; as the di- "vinely appointed lawgiver, who received his instructions (*Tora* the "Israelites called it,) from the mouth of Yahwe himself. But it is "not very important for us to be able to say that Moses did just "this and that. Under the guidance of God, Israel grew in wisdom, "and worked out a great Tora, an instruction in righteousness; and "it matters little to us whether it was Moses or somebody else, who "had the chief part in it. But it is probable that he was a great man, "and did much for his people." p.p. 25, 26.

"*The march from Goshen to Canaan.* After leaving Egypt, the "Israelites seem to have moved from place to place, in the northern "part of Arabia, where they spent some time, before reaching Canaan. "Their route is described in a general way in the books of Deuter- "onomy (1-3 and 10: 6-7) Exodus (14-19) and Numbers 10-14. 20- "22); and there is a list of stations, (an itinerary) in Numbers 33 "ch. But these were written so long after the events occurred, that "we cannot rely on their correctness. Whether, on leaving Goshen, "they crossed the upper part of the Red Sea, or skirted the Sirbo- "nian lake, or went some other way, there is at present no means of "determining. There was in later times a firm belief among the "Israelites, that they had spent sometime at Mount Sinai, in the "peninsula called by the Greeks and Romans Arabia Petrea, and "that there, the Law was given by God through Moses. We know that "it was not there, that God gave Israel its law; but the people, or a "part of them, may have stayed there awhile. Thence they marched "northward towards the Dead Sea, and perhaps approached their "new land, in two divisions, one on the east, and one on the west of "the sea." p. 27.

I have quoted thus largely from Dr. Toy's book, for two reasons— (1.) It is the first attempt made, in so far as I know, to bring the conclusions of the Higher Critics, to the attention of the mass of the people. His "History of the Religion of Israel" was prepared for the use of Sabbath Schools, and is published by "The Unitarian Sunday School Society, Boston:" and (2.) It seems to me, that Dr. Toy has but honestly and fairly carried out the principles of the higher criticisms, to their legitimate conclusions.

I do Dr. Toy no injustice, I think, when I state as his conclusions, (1.) That there is no sufficient reason to believe that Moses wrote any part of the Pentateuch,—even the small portion which Professor Smith assigns him, and (2.) That the Pentateuch is not "correct" or creditble history.

In opposition to all this, the long-established faith of the Church is briefly and well expressed in the words of the text—"*The Law was given by Moses.*"

"*The Law.*" "When the word Law is used with the article, and without any word of limitation, it refers to the expressed will of God, and in nine cases out of ten to the Mosaic Law, or the Pentateuch of which it forms the chief portion." Smith's Bible Dictionary.

"*Was given,*" i. e. God-given, as is expressly affirmed in the Pentateuch many times.

"*By Moses,*" i. e. by Moses as God's agent, accredited by him to Israel, in many ways.

The common faith of the Church—*traditional* faith, the higher critics like to call it—is, that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, and is inspired, in the sense in which Peter defines that word—"Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (II Pet. 1: 21,) and is therefore credible history.

Which of these conclusions shall we accept, that of Dr. Toy, or the common faith of the Church? Let the principle professedly followed by the higher critics, viz: to judge of questions concerning the Scriptures, just as we would judge of similar questions respecting any other book, decide.

There is a book bearing the title of Julius Cæsar's Gallic Wars," which is universally received,—by the higher critics as well as others,—as written by the man whose name it bears, and as credible history. I select this book because its author, Julius Cæsar sustains to his history, very much the same relation that Moses does to the Pentateuch, he was an eye-witness and a principal actor in the events he records. Why do we receive this book as authentic, i. e. written by the man whose name it bears, and credible; i. e. worthy to be believed? Mainly, for the reasons:—

(1.) The book, in several passages, claims to have been written by Julius Cæsar, and to be true history.

(2.) It has been quoted and referred to by writers in every age, from Cæsar's day to the present, as authentic and credible.

(3.) It bears internal marks of having been written by Cæsar, and of being true history.

Let us apply these rules of judging to the case of Moses and the Pentateuch.

I. THE PENTATEUCH CLAIMS MOSES AS ITS AUTHOR, AND TO BE TRUE HISTORY, IN SUCH PASSAGES AS THE FOLLOWING, VIZ:

"And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments: and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do, And *Moses wrote* all the words of the Lord." Ex. 24: 3, 4. "And the

Lord said unto Moses, *Write* thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee, and with Israel." Ex. 34: 27. "And *Moses wrote* their goings out according to their journeys, by the commandment of the Lord; and these are their journeys according to their goings out.' Numb. 33: 2. This is the introduction to the itinerary of Israel's travels in the wilderness, of which Dr. Toy explicitly denies the Mosaic authorship, and says it "was written so long after the events occurred that we cannot rely on its correctness."

"And *Moses wrote* this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto the elders of Israel. And Moses commanded them, saying, at the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel has come to appear before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing." Deut. 31: 9-11. Of a compliance with the requirement, thus publicly to read the law, we have an account in Nehemiah ch. 8, where it is said the reading continued "from the morning until midday."

"And it came to pass, that when *Moses had made an end of writing* the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against you, for I know thy rebellion, and thy stiff neck; behold, while I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against the Lord; and how much more after my death." Deut. 31: 24-27. The book here mentioned is doubtless the book found in the temple in Josiah's day, (see II Chron. ch. 34) about which the higher critics have written so much.

It is true, that in none of the passages quoted above, does Moses claim to have written all of the Pentateuch, but, fairly interpreted, he certainly does claim to have written the most important parts of it, and the very parts of which the higher critics deny his authorship.

II. THE PENTATEUCH HAS BEEN QUOTED, AND REFERRED TO BY WRITERS IN EVERY AGE, FROM MOSES' DAY TO THE PRESENT, AS AUTHENTIC AND CREDIBLE.

Before proceeding to cite these quotations and references, I would ask the reader to remark the fact, that the Bible is not one book, written by one man, and at one time; but is a collection of many books, written by different men, at different times, during a period of fifteen centuries. The Old Testament contains all the extant literature of a great nation for a period of a thousand years.

Beginning with the oldest of these books, other than the five

books ascribed to Moses, viz: The book of Joshua, who for a large part of his life was Moses' cotemporary, and succeeded him in the leadership of Israel,—we read—"The Lord spake unto Joshua, the son of Nun.....be thou strong and very courageous, that thou mayest observe to do according to all *the law which Moses* my servant commanded thee; turn not from it to the right hand or to the left, that thou mayest prosper whithersoever thou goest. This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thus mayest observe to do according to all that *is written* therein." Josh. 1: 7, 8.

And here, let me remark in passing, to dispose of a silly cavil, that the brief chapter with which the book of Deuteronomy closes, and which contains an account of the death and burial of Moses, was doubtless written by Joshua; and belongs rather to the book of Joshua than to that of Deuteronomy, the first mentioned of these books being but a continuation of the history given us in the last mentioned.

In the book of Judges, which continues the history of Israel for a period of 300 years, from the date at which the book of Joshua closes, we read:—"Now these are the nations which the Lord left, ... to prove Israel by them, to know whether they would harken unto the commandments of the Lord, which he commanded their fathers by *the hand of Moses.*" Judges 3: 1-4.

The 105th and 106th Psalms contain a brief recapitulation of the chief incidents in the history of Israel, as given in the Pentateuch, cited as grounds of thanksgiving to God on the part of Israel. The 90th Psalm bears the title, "*A prayer of Moses the man of God.*" "The correctness of the title which ascribes this psalm to Moses is confirmed by its unique simplicity and grandeur; its appropriateness to his times and circumstances; its resemblance to the Law in urging the connection between sin and death; its similarity of diction to the poetical portions of the Pentateuch, without the slightest trace of imitation or quotation; its marked unlikeness to the Psalms of David, and still more to those of later date; and finally the proved impossibility of plausibly assigning it to any other age or author." *J. A. Alexander.*

David's parting charge to Solomon is in the words:—"I go the way of all the earth: be thou strong therefore, and show thyself a man; and keep the charge of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statute, and his commandments, and his judgments, and his testimonies as it it is written in *the law of Moses*, that thou mayest prosper in all that thou doest, and whithersoever thou turnest thyself." I Kings 2: 2, 3.

In his prayer at the dedication of the first temple, Solomon urges as a reason why God should hear the prayers of Israel,—"For thou didst separate them from among all the people of the earth, to be thine inheritance, as thou spakest by the hand of *Moses thy servant*,

when thou broughtest our fathers out of Egypt, O Lord our God," —and he follows the prayer with a blessing of the people in the words,—"Blessed be the Lord, that hath given rest unto his people Israel, according to all that he promised; there hath not failed one word of all his good promise, which he promised by the hand of *Moses his servant.*" I Kings 8: 53, 56.

In the account of the reformation effected in the days of King Hezekiah,—in whose reign the Prophet Isaiah lived and prophesied, we read—"He removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it, and called it Nehushtan." II Kings 18: 4 Of Moses making this brazen serpent we have an account in Numb. 21: 8, 9.

At a later date, and shortly before the captivity in Babylon, King Josiah in giving directions for observing the passover says—"So kill the passover, and sanctify yourselves, and prepare your brethren, that they may do according to the word of the Lord by *the hand of Moses.*" And in the account of the observance of that passover we read.—"And they removed the burnt offerings, that they might give according to the divisions of the families of the people, to offer unto the Lord, as it is written in *the book of Moses.*" II Chron. 35: 6, 12.

As instances of the recognition of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and its historic credibility by the Prophets, take the following, viz:

By Isaiah, who lived before the captivity,—"Then he remembered the days of old, *Moses* and his people, saying, where is he that brought them up out of the sea, with the shepherd of his flock? where is he that put his Holy Spirit within him? That led them by the *right hand of Moses*, with his glorious arm, dividing the water before them, to make himself an everlasting name?" Isaiah 63: 11, 12,

By Daniel, who lived during the captivity,—"Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in *the law of Moses* the servant of God, because we have sinned against him. And he hath confirmed his word, which he spake against us, and against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon us a great evil: for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem. As it is written in *the law of Moses*, all this evil is come upon us." Dan. 9: 11-13.

By Malachi, who lived after the restoration, and whose prophecy closes the Old Testament Scriptures,—"Remember ye the *law of Moses* my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and Judgment." Mal. 4: 4.

Turning now to the New Testament, we have the testimony of the Apostles, in such words as these, viz:—

Of John:—"*The Law was given by Moses.*" John I: 17.

Of Philip:—"And Philip findeth Nathaniel, and saith unto him, We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." John I: 45.

Of James, "And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying.....For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day." Acts 15: 21.

Of Jude, or "Judas, not Iscariot," as he is called in John 14: 22. "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and run greedily after the error of Baalim for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core." Jude 7, 11. The story of Sodom and Gomorrah, of Cain and Baalim and Core or Korah, is found in the Pentateuch alone.

Of Peter. "And Peter answered unto the people....*Moses truly said unto the fathers*, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." Acts 3: 22. Quoted from Deut. 18: 15.

Of Paul. "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." Rom. 5: 14. "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." I Cor. 10: 1, 2. "Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth." II Tim. 3: 8.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, generally ascribed to Paul as its author, is, in large part, a commentary on "*the Law of Moses;* And in all it says of Abraham, and Melchisedec, and Aaron, and of the Patriarchs, in its illustrations of the nature of faith in Ch. XI, it takes for granted, the truth of the history contained in the Pentateuch.

The testimony of our Lord to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and its credibility as history, is oft repeated and explicit. As specimens of this testimony take the following, viz:

"Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words." John 5: 45-47.

"They said therefore unto him, what sign showest thou then, that we may see and believe thee; what dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, he gave them bread from heaven to eat. Then Jesus said unto them, verily, verily,

I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven." John 6: 31, 32.

"Did not Moses give you the Law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me. The people answered and said, thou hast a devil; who goeth about to kill thee? Jesus answered and said unto them, I have done one work and ye all marvel. Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision; (not because it is of Moses, but of the father;) and ye on the sabbath day circumcise a man. If a man on the sabbath day receive circumcision that *the Law of Moses* should not be broken, are ye angry with me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the sabbath day?" John 7: 19-23.

When Our Lord had healed a leper, he "said unto him, See thou tell no man; but go thy way, show thyself to the Priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them." Matt. 8: 4. For the law referred to see Lev. 13 and 14 Chs.

"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living." Luke 20: 37, 38.

To his two sorrowing disciples at Emmaus, Our Lord said—"O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken; Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at *Moses* and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself." Luke 24: 25-27.

"And he said unto them (i. e. his Apostles) These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in *the Law of Moses*, and in the prophets and in the psalms, concerning me." Luke 24: 44.

Such is the explicit testimony of Prophets and Apostles, and of our Lord himself, to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and to its credibility; besides passages almost innumerable to be found throughout the Old and New Testaments in which, by fair implication, the authenticity and credibility of the Pentateuch is taken for granted:—and in view of these facts, I remark, the evidence of this kind for Cæsar's authorship of "The Gallic Wars," and the credibility of that book is not a tithe of that there is for Moses' authorship of "The Law," and its truth as history.

Thus far we have considered the testimony of Prophets and Apostles, and of Our Lord himself, as the testimony of ordinary men. But in forming a judgment, respecting questions of the kind before us, in the case of other books, we always take into account the character, and probable means of information of the witnesses. It is a dictate of reason that witnesses should be weighed as well as counted. Prophets and Apostles claim to have written under inspiration of God; and our Lord claims to be truly and properly di-

vine; to be God as well as man; and these facts must be taken into account if we would deal with the Pentateuch just as we deal with any other book.

I. *Prophets and Apostles claim to have written under "inspiration of God."*

What do we mean by "inspiration of God?" Let us see if we can get from the Scriptures themselves, a satisfactory definition of the term:—And this is the more necessary, because many writers, especially the advocates of the Higher Criticism, have juggled with the term, until in their hands it has come to mean anything or nothing, as best suits their purpose,

The expression is used in II Tim. 3: 16. "All scripture is given by *inspiration of God;*"—and it is defined in such passages as the following, viz:

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." Heb. 1: 1, 2.

"When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God." I Thess. 2: 13.

"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were move by the Holy Ghost." II Pet. 1: 2I.

"Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual," (or as Dr. C. Hoge renders the last clause—"joining spiritual things to spiritual words.") I Cor. 2: 13.

With any fair interpretation, these passages cannot be made to teach less than:—(1) That in the scriptures we have an errorless record of truth, a record worthy to bear the name of "the word of God:" and (2) That this errorless record of truth has been made under the moving power of the God, the Holy Ghost.

In consistency with this doctrine, a careful examination of Scripture will show, that this inspiration of God the Spirit, did not interfere with the free and natural operation of the writer's own mind, did not obliterate his characteristic peculiarities of thought and diction. There is as marked a difference in style between the historic book of Genesis, and the poetic book of Isaiah, as between the writings of Thucydides and those of Homer. And this is in perfect accord with what experience teaches us of the operation of this same Holy Spirit upon the human spirit in regeneration and sanctification. Peter and John had characteristic peculiarities, of spirit

as well as body, before their regeneration; they retained those peculiarties as long as they lived on earth:—and I doubt not, they will retain them evermore:—that in heaven, after the resurrection of the body has made the work of redemption complete, Peter will be Peter still, and John will be John.

Inspiration did not supersede the use of such means of information as, in God's providence, were within the writer's reach. Thus, Luke writes—"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye witnesses, and ministers of the word; It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." Luke 1: 1-4. It may be that Moses, in writing the book of Genesis, made use of traditions current among his people; possibly, of historic documents, which had come down to him from former generations: But this much is fairly implied in his writings being a part of the Word of God, that if he did make use of such information, he was guided by God the Spirit in the selection of the material used, separating between the appropriate and the inappropriate, the true and the false. Nothing less than this would make his writings worthy the title of "the Word of God."

There are two questions which have been much discussed of late, viz: (1) Is the inspiration of Scripture *plenary?* i. e. full, such as to make it an errorless record on all points on which it speaks, and not in matters of doctrine, and the essentials of the christian faith only. To this, I answer, yes. It is plenary. The original autograph of the sacred writers was an errorless record, though errors may have, and as a matter of fact, unquestionably have crept in in the process of transmission from the writer's days to ours. (2) Is inspiration verbal? To this I answer:—Not in the sense which would make the writer a mere amanuensis; but it is verbal in such a sense as is implied in Paul's words—"which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, joining spiritual things to spiritual words." I Cor. 2: 13.

Such is the doctrine of inspiration as plainly taught in Scripture. Prophets and Apostles wrote under the influence of inspiration, the inspiration of God the Spirit. Our Lord was himself the Son of God. Taking into account, now, as we would in the case of any other book, the character of the witnesses, do I go too far when I say that to the christian, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and its truth as history, are established as fully and firmly, as it is possible for testimony to establish anything;—that it comes to us sealed with the seal of God himself.

III. THE PENTATEUCH BEARS INTERNAL MARKS OF HAVING BEEN WRITTEN BY MOSES, AND OF BEING TRUE HISTORY.

1. *The literary style of a book is often appealed to in settling its age and authorship.* It is on this question, largely, that the Higher Criticism rejects the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; Prof. R. Smith contending that in differences of style we have evidence of the work of at least four different authors, in the books usually ascribed to Moses.

The argument on this ground cannot be presented in a popular form, and from the pulpit. I will not, therefore attempt anything of the kind, but instead thereof ask your attention to what Prof. F. L. Patton of Princeton, one of the ablest scholars and logicians of our day and country, has written on the subject. In an article published in "The Presbyterian Review" for April 1883, he writes:

"English readers are not unfamiliar with the precarious nature of arguments based on style. Some of us have not forgotten the discussion of the question whether Bacon wrote Shakspeare. Stanly Leathens, himself a Hebruist, makes admirable use of a controversy carried on in the columns of the London Times respecting the authorship of a poem, and says: If, some two hundred years after Milton's death, a number of educated Englishmen, versed in the many known writings of Milton, cannot agree about the authorship of a certain poem upon internal evidence, are we to believe that great weight should be attached to the assertion of a German critic, who some twenty-five centuries after the death of a Hebrew Prophet declares positive upon internal evidence alone [for here there is no handwriting to help us] that a series of Poems are not by him." He is speaking of what he calls "the imaginary figment of a second Isaiah," but the illustration suits the question in hand equally well.

"It would have been better for the theory of a fourfold narative; so far as we are concerned, had Prof. Smith contented himself with the *argumentum ad ignorantiam*, and told us that this is a matter that no one but a critic can understand. For in attempting to make us see the argument upon which criticism relies, he has confirmed our scepticism. We may assume that in illustrating differences of style between Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy, he would not choose the passages in which it is least apparent; indeed, when we read the parallel passages in which he holds up this difference of style, to the gaze of eyes that are kindly supposed to be unfamiliar with the Hebrew text, we take it for granted that we have before us a crucial instance. As such we have studied it according to our lights; and our conclusion is that, judging by the differences apparent in these passages, the critics have most ungrudgingly, obeyed the law of parsimony when they assign only four authors to the Pentateuch. Why not forty? For we have no hesitation in saying

that by the same rule which gives four authors and a redactor to the Pentateuch, we will undertake to show that four authors and as many redactors were concerned in each of the articles written by Prof. Smith and Dr. Briggs."

"But let us listen to what specialists have to say upon this subject. Prof. Smith admits that "literary criticism, though a good and delicate tool," is subject "to special limitations in the case of Hebrew," and that "when carried beyond a certain point it arouses suspicion." Prof. Curtiss tells us there is "need of great caution in accepting the analyses of the critics." Dr. Green regards the recent right-about-face as to the order of the Elohist and the Jehovist as "a fresh demonstration of the precarious and inconclusive nature of the entire process of argument." Stanley Leathers pronounces unsatisfactory and unsound the results of criticism" which arise from the application of the Elohistic and Jehovistic theory to the composition of the Pentateuch." "Imaginative and unreasonably arbitrary" says Dr. McCaul, speaking of the Elohistic question; and Dr. Harold Browne puts his estimate upon the theory that denies the Mosaic authorship of Genesis when he says: "the romance of modern criticism is as remarkable as its perverse ingenuity."

2. *In the case of Historical writings, unexpected confirmations of their incidental statements by other writings of admitted authority, properly, have great weight in deciding such questions as that before us.*

As instances of this sort of confirmation of the authenticity and credibility of the Pentateuch, take the following, viz:

(1.) In Gen. 41: 14, we read—"Then Pharaoh sent and called Joseph, and they brought him hastily out of the dungeon; and he *shaved himself*, and changed his raiment, and came in unto Pharaoh." On this Hengstenberg remarks—"Even the most prejudiced mind, in this incidental notice, recognize a purely Egyptian custom. Herodotus mentions it among the distinguishing peculiarities of the Egyptians, that they commonly were shaved, but in mourning they allowed the beard to grow. The sculptures also agree with this representation. So particular, says Wilkinson, were they on this point, that to have neglected it, was a subject of reproach and ridicule; and whenever they intended to convey the idea of a man of low condition, or a slovenly person, the artist represented him with a beard. Although foreigners, says the same author, who were brought to Egypt as slaves, had beard on their arrival in the country, we find that as soon as they were employed in the service of this civilized people, they were obliged to conform to the cleanly habits of their masters; their beards and head were shaved; and they adopted a close cap." (*Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 30.)

(2) In Gen. 43: 31-33, we read: And he (Joseph) washed his face, and went out, and refrained himself, and said, set on bread. And they set on for him by himself, and for them by themselves;

and for the Egpytians, which did not eat with them, by themselves; because the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination to the Egyptians, And they *sat* before him." On this account Hengstenberg remarks—"Herodotus tells us that the Egyptians abstained from all familiar intercourse with foreigners, since these were unclean to them, especially because they slew and ate the animals which were sacred among the Egyptians. Therefore (since the Egyptians honor much the cow) no Egyptian man or woman will kiss a Greek upon the mouth, they also use no knife or fork or kettle of a Greek, and will not eat the flesh of any clean beast if it has been cut up with a Greek knife. The circumstance that Joseph eats separately from the other Egyptians, is strictly in accordance with the great difference of rank, and the spirit of cast which prevailed among the Egyptians."

"It appears from V 33, that the brothers of Joseph *sat* before him at the table, while according to patriarchal practice they were accustomed to recline. It appears from the sculptures, that the Egyptians also were in the habit of sitting at table, although they had couches. Sofas were used for sleeping. In a painting in Rosellim, each one of the guests sits upon a stool, which in accordance with the custom took the place of the couch." (*Egypt and the Books of Moses, p. p.* 37, 38.) For numerous other instances of a similar character, the reader can consult the book from which the above quotations are made.

(3) A very remarkable "undesigned confirmation" of the history contained in Genesis, has lately been brought to light. In his study of the papyri and inscriptions in the tombs which especially concern the daily life and habits of the Egyptians, Brugsch-Bey, one of the best informed among the Egyptologists of the present day, has made out, what may be called, an Egyptian "price-current," of the days of Joseph. According to this—

A Slave sold for	$9.73
An Ox " "	.31
A Goat " "	.7 7-10
A Pair of Fowls	.1
A Razor	.3½

(*Osborn's Ancient Egypt, p.* 82.)

If we turn now to Gen. 37: 28, we read, "And they sold Joseph to the Ishmalites for twenty pieces of silver; and they brought Joseph into Egypt." The piece of silver was doubtless the silver sheekle, worth, according to the best authority, a little less than 50 cents of our money:—the twenty pieces of silver corresponding almost exactly to the $9.73 of the old Egyptian "price-current."

3 *The character of the communications, and the style of thought and reasoning of a book, often furnish important evidence respecting its age and authorsh p.*

The Pentateuch contains a communication, commonly spoken of

as "the Moral Law" or "the Ten Commandments,"—which the author claims to have received directly from God; first, as spoken in audible words from the top of Sinai, and afterwards on "two tables of stone, written with the finger of God." According to this claim God is the author of this law in a very peculiar sense. Does the nature and style of this Law correspond to such a claim?

In a little tract, published by the American Tract Society many years ago, an eminent lawyer gives the following brief summary of the Moral Law, with his own remarks thereon: "I have been looking," writes he—"into the nature of that law. I have been trying to see whether I can add anything to it, or take anything from it so as to make it better. I cannot. It is perfect."

"The first commandment," continues he, "directs us to make the Creator the object of our supreme love and reverence. This is right. If he be our Creator, Preserver, and Supreme Benefactor, we ought to treat him, and none other, as such."

"The second forbids idolatry. That certainly is right."

"The third forbids profaneness."

"The fourth finds a time for religious worship. If there be a God, he ought surely to be worshipped. It is suitable that there should be an outward homage, significant of our inward regard. If God be worshipped, it is proper that some time should be set apart for that purpose, when all may worship him harmoniously and without interruption. One day in seven is certainly not too much; and I do not know that it is too little.

"The fifth defines the peculiar duties arising from the family relations."

"Injuries to our neighbor are then classified by the Moral Law. They are divided into offences against life, chastity, property and character. And applying a legal idea, I notice that the greatest offense in each class is expressly forbidden. Thus, the greatest injury to life is murder; to chastity, adultery; to property, theft; to character, perjury. Now the greater offense must include the less of the same kind. Murder must include every injury to life; adultery every injury to purity; and so of the rest. And the moral code is closed and perfected by a command forbidding every improper desire in regard to our neighbor."

Where did Moses get that law? I have read history: the Egyptians and adjacent nations were idolaters; so were the Greeks and Romans, and the wisest and best Greeks or Romans never gave a code of morals like this. Where did Moses get this law which surpasses the wisdom and philosophy of the most enlightened age? He lived at a period comparatively barbarous; but he has given a law, in which the learning and sagacity of all subsequent time can detect no flaw. Where did he get it? He could not have soared so far from his age as to have devised it himself. *It must have come from heaven.*"

And this is just what is affirmed respecting it in the Pentateuch. As Rousseau, after a careful study of the character of Christ Jesus as set forth in the gospel, said—"It is more inconceivable that a number of persons should agree to write such a history, than that one should furnish the subject of it"—so may we say respecting the Ten Commandments, that it is more inconceivable that any man of the age and people, among whom they first appeared should have written them, than that they were "written on two tables of stone, by the finger of God" as is affirmed in the Pentateuch.

In our examination of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentatench, and its credibility, we have now applied the tests by which similar questions respecting other books are determined, and in view of all the facts of the case, I see not how the thoughtful man can avoid the conclusion that the books were written by Moses, that they are true history, and, as they claim, written under inspiration of God.

1. A radical fault in much of the reasoning of the Higher Critics is their utterly ignoring the divine element in the authorship of the Scriptures.

The Bible claims for itself a divine as well as a human agency in its production. "Holy men of God spake,"—there is the human,—"as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (I Pet, 21: 21)—there is the divine agency. There is a true sense then in which it is a God-made book, and we cannot deal fairly with it, judge of it just as we would judge of any other book, if we ignore this fact; and a disregard of it must inevitably lead us into error.

In our day the art of making artifical, man-made flowers has been carried to great perfection, especially in the city of Paris, to such perfection that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish at a little distanc, between them and the natural, God-made, flowers which are produced in our gardens. If we disregard this distinction, and treat all flowers as man-made, it will lead to the greatest absurdities. For example—take the best artifical rose-maker in Paris, a glass of water and a handful of charcoal, and ask her to make you a rose of it;—will she be much to blame if she thinks you crazy? and yet that is the very material out of which the most beautiful God-made rose has been constructed. Or, suppose I take a natural rose, one that has grown in my graden, and attempt to answer the question—where was it produced? It is very perfect in its form and structure, much more so than the rose made in New York or Philadelphia,—it must have been made in Paris. And this is the only rational conclusion to which I can come if all roses are artifical, man-made.

Not one whit more reasonable than this is the conclusion of the Higher Critics, from Gen. 36: 31, "And these are the Kings that reigned in the land of Edom before there reigned any King over the children of Israel," that this portion of Genesis, at least, must have been written after the days of Saul, the first King of Israel. The inference is reasonable if the book has no divine element in its

authorship; but if it has such an element, if in a true sense of the expression, the book is God-made; then this passage must be regarded as nothing more than an instance of predictive prophesy, and is worthy of no more attention in fixing the date of the book than—Gen. 35: 11, "And God said unto him, I am God Almighty; be fruitful and multiply; a nation, and a company of nations shall be of thee, and *Kings* shall come out of thy loins."

2. A second radical fallacy in the reasoning of the Higher Critics is their utterly ignoring the divine agency, in man's progress in civilization and religion; and assuming that all such progress has been made through the agency of reason alone, and by a regular process of developement or evolution. Dr. Toy writes—"The facts "that have come to our knowledge make it probable that all the an- "cient or national religions originated in the same way, and grew "according to the same laws. The differences between them are "the differences between the peoples to whom they belong. Up to a "certain point in their development they are all alike, and then "they begin to show their local peculiarities. Of the earliest stage "in the growth of Israel's religion, the fetishistic, we known almost "nothing; when we first find them in Canaan, they are polytheist, "like their neighbors, that is, they had separated the Deity from "the objects of nature, and regarded these last as symbols of the "Godhead. Thus much of their religious career belongs to the "general history of ancient religions." (*History of the Religion of Israel, p.* 148.)

In common with the advocates of the Darwinian theory of evolution of man from the brute, Dr. Toy here assumes that man, as man, began his course upon earth as the most ignorant, debased and superstitious savage; and gradually, by his own effort, continued through ages, worked out a civilization and a religion for himself; that God having created man, if he did, indeed, create him, a pitiable troglodyte, like the Digger Indians of the West, left him to work out his destiny as best he could, and anything inconsistent with this monstrous hypothesis he treats as irrational and unworthy of credit.

In irreconcilable opposition to all such assumptions as this the Bible teaches that at man's creation. "God said let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." (Gen. 1: 26, 27.) And David writes—"Thou madest him (man) a little lower than the angels, and has crowned him with glory and honor. thou madest him to have dominion over the work of thy hands." (Ps. 8: 5, 6.) Civilized man has "dominion over the work of God's hands" to-day, over the steam which drives our machinery, and the electricity which carries our messages around the earth, not because

he is mightier than they, but because he has learned the fixed laws which govern these agents, and through the operation of these laws, compels them to do his bidding. Of any other dominion than this we know nothing.

In consistency with this idea of man's condition at the beginning, we read, in the third Chapter of Genesis:—of the division of labor, —"Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground" —of the building of Cities,—"and he builded a city and called the city after the name of his son Enoch"—of mechanics and metallurgists,—"Tubal-Cain was an instructor of every artificer in brass and in iron"—and of music and musical instruments,—"Jubal was the father of all such as handle the harp and the organ"—all of them marks of an advanced civilization. We read also of Abel and Cain, as engaging in the Public Worship of God; the one, by bloody sacrifice, which he "offered in faith," (Heb. 11: 4) the representative of the religion of the Gospel; the other by his offering of the fruit of the ground," the representative of "natural religion," the two great phases of religious thought among the civilized peoples of to-day. From this condition of advanced civilization, the scriptures teach us that man sank from generation to generation, through the degrading influence of sin, until christianity, in its form of world-wide activity, commenced its reclaiming work. On many tribes and peoples christianity has not yet been brought to bear, and they are the troglodytes and cannibals of to-day, in "the paleolothie, or old stone age" of their existence. Among others it has long been at work, e. g. the people of Great Britain and America; and they lead the van of civilization, and dominate the world.

With this scriptural idea of the course of civilization, the facts of authentic history, and the monuments of antiquity, all agree. The oldest civilization of which we can learn anything with certainty outside the records of scripture, is the Egyptian; and among the monuments of this Egyptian civilization, the grandest are confessedly the oldest. So it is with the Assyrian and Indian civilizations, the written and monumental records of which have lately been disentombed. On our Western Continent, the civilization of the empire of the Incas in South America, was far in advance of that of their descendants in our time. The mouldering temple of Central America, and the rock cities of New Mexico tell the same story. Standing on the height of our modern civilization, and looking away into the long past, the farthest off of the objects distinctly seen, are the pyramids and temples of Egypt, and then the palaces and great cities of the valley of the Euphrates, and then the rock-hewn temples and old pagodas of India and China, all telling—not of savage man working up, through force of intellect, from savagery to civilization; but of civilized man, sinking lower and lower, from generation to generation—all utterly inconsistent with the assumption of the higher critics—all confirming the simple story of the Bible.

Returning now, in conclusion, to the question with which we started, and which we then remitted to the present stage of the discussion—What is "the higher criticism," I answer—It is a system of "destructive criticism," false in some of its most important and fundamental assumptions, partial and unfair in its application of the criteria of judgment to questions concerning the authorship and credibility of the books of scripture, and unreliable in its methods, even when those methods are least open to objection.

Carried out to its legitimate results, as it is in Dr. Toy's "History of the Religion of Israel."

(1.) *It takes away from us the Bible as the word of God;* though Dr. Toy would doubtless repudiate such a conclusion. But how can a plain man look upon a book as the word of God which is but a mass of fables and falsehoods; e. g. a book which holds up Abraham as "the father of the faithful" and "the friend of God," when in fact he was but a savage fetish worshipper, and this he must have been if Israel did not emerge from fetishism until their settlement in Canaan—a book which tells of Moses, as the man by whom "the law was given" at Sinai, when, in fact, it is doubtful if Moses was ever at Sinai, and the law was not written until a thousand years after Moses died, and then written out by some old priest or prophet, and palmed upon the people under the false pretense that it was Moses' work, to give it authority in Israel?

(2.) *It takes from us Christianity as a supernatural religion revealed of God;* though Dr. Toy would probably repudiate this conclusion also. But how can it be avoided if the religion of Israel, like Buddism or Confucionism, is but one of the "natural religions, which all originated in the same way, and grew according to the same laws?"

"Let no man deceive you with vain words." (Eph. 5: 6.) "It is the gospel of Christ," our holy religion which is in controvery. The higher criticism is but an attack "within the walls," just as the atheism of Payne and Ingersoll is an attack from without. We need not, we do not fear the result We have the Master's assurance that his church, with all that is precious in the gospel it enshrines, "is built upon a rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. 16: 18.)